Plans in LD

What a plan is: Parametricizes the resolution while still being topical. Does not defend the whole resolution. The Plan utilizes fiat, a theoretical way to evaluate a plan’s desirability rather than its probability.

A plan’s components: Topicality – whether the plan falls under the wording of the resolution. Topicality is much easier when you’re running a plan because you must have a specific text. Inherency – the status quo is not solving the harms of the case and is not doing the plan. Structural inherency says there are laws or other barriers to the implementation of the plan. Attitudinal inherency says beliefs exist in the society that stop society from enacting the plan. Existential inherency says that the harms exist, so the status quo cannot solve the problem. Harms – Affirmative should and must demonstrate some negative impact exist in the status quo that the plan solves. Harms and advantages are not the same thing. Solvency – why a plan will solve the harms listed in a plan. You need evidence from a solvency advocate who says that you will solve the harms. Running a plan without a solvency advocate is abusive because Negative cannot research a plan that no one advocates. Significance – no longer an important issue. A plan is now weighed by net benefits, and people never knew when a plan could be labeled significant.

Plan structure: Traditional structure – harms, inherency, plan text, solvency. If you have multiple harms, the arguments for solvency may be different, meaning that the plan would be disjointed. The advantage structure – inherency, plan text, advantage. Framework sometimes comes at the end, telling the judge how to evaluate the plan. In LD, it might be wise to put a framework at the beginning of the LD plan. You also need to justify your running a plan.

Theoretical justifications for plans: Depth of very specific impacts increases through a plan. Real world decision making is accessed because nobody talks about decision making in very broad sweeps. Topic literature may be more specific. Prevents advocacy shifts. Better for clash. Say you will prove the advantage of your plan and outweigh any generic disadvantages. You need to experiment with the plan because it’s not a generic LD argumentation structure.

Why running a plan is good: Narrows the focus of the debate – you will almost always be more prepared to debate the narrow area. Decreases the Negative’s ground for disadvantages, Kritiks, and counterplans. Stops Negative from making resolution-minus arguments. More in-depth argumentation with more specific evidence. There’s an increased probability of your link story happening. The evidence is more difficult to answer because there are fewer exceptions. A plan will trip up your opponent because they don’t prep for plans. People don’t know how to debate the structure and convention of plans. People are intimidated by plans; they shut down because they don’t know what to do.

Disadvantages to running a plan: A lot of judges in LD are resistant to plans. Some judges don’t know what a plan is or its conventions. Some judges think the Affirmative should defend the whole resolution. You’re susceptible to theory. Disadvantages will stick with much better link stories.

Theory against a plan: Affirmative burden is to defend the whole resolution. Plans kill tons of Negative ground. There are tons of plans, making Affirmative unpredictable. Say that breadth matters more than depth. A squirrelly plan may shift debate away from the mainstream issues. Big picture education is better because you can apply it to more specific situations. Topicality issues.